

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 415

HE 014 303

AUTHOR Brown, Peggy, Ed.
TITLE Project Lodestar Special Report.
INSTITUTION Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Aug 81
NOTE 15p.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009.
JOURNAL CIT Forum for Liberal Education; v3 n8 Aug 1981

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; Advisory Committees; Articulation (Education); Church Related Colleges; College Planning; *College Role; College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; *Consultation Programs; *Curriculum Evaluation; Degree Requirements; Developmental Studies Programs; Elective Courses; *General Education; Governance; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Institutional Evaluation; Intercollegiate Cooperation; Interdisciplinary Approach; *Liberal Arts; Policy Formation; Private Colleges; Religious Education; School Organization; Seminars; State Universities; Undergraduate Study; Womens Education
IDENTIFIERS *Project Lodestar

ABSTRACT

The Association of American Colleges' (AAC) Project Lodestar is addressed in an article and descriptions of the pilot phase of the project at 13 institutions. In "Project Lodestar: Realistically Assessing the Future," Peggy Brown provides an overview of the project, which is designed to help colleges and universities in assessment of institutional missions and goals, administrative structures, and overall curriculum. To provide this assessment AAC sends teams of consultants to member institutions requesting assistance. By learning what are successful approaches to reviewing curriculum and conducting a self-study, AAC hopes to develop a guide for examining the mission and curriculum needs of various types of institutions. The following institutional projects are described: academic divisions and curriculum planning at Birmingham-Southern College, Alabama; new developments in graduate studies at Sonoma State University, California; interinstitutional cooperation at College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University, Minnesota; restructuring the general education curriculum at Rutgers University, University College-Newark; general education planning at Trinity College, Vermont; interinstitutional relationships and transfer student articulation at DePaul University, Illinois; development of interdisciplinary seminars at Marymount Manhattan College, New York; General education review at Elon College, North Carolina; curriculum review at Trinity College, Connecticut; planning for the future at Mount Vernon College, Washington, DC; academic planning at Hartwick College, New York; revised general education curriculum at Gwynedd-Mercy College, Pennsylvania; and special studies program at East Carolina University, North Carolina. (SW)

The Forum for Liberal Education

Forum

ED 207 415

July/August 1981
Volume III, Number 8

Project Lodestar: Realistically Assessing the Future Peggy Brown	1
Birmingham-Southern College	3
Sonoma State University	4
College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University	5
Rutgers University, University College-Newark	5
Trinity College (Vermont) ...	6
DePaul University	7
Marymount Manhattan College	8
Elon College	9
Trinity College (Connecticut) 10	
Mount Vernon College	11
Hartwick College	12
Gwynedd-Mercy College ...	13
East Carolina University	14

AAC
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC):

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFORM ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

HE014-303

AAC

Association of American Colleges
1818 R Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202) 387-3760

Project Lodestar Special Report

Lodestar, n. 1. a star that leads. 2. the polestar. 3. the cynosure. 4. a center of attention and concern.

This issue of The Forum for Liberal Education examines 13 institutions which participated in pilot phase and first year activities of AAC's Project Lodestar, a special advisory service supported by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The projects described in the following pages reflect the challenges facing higher education as it looks toward the future.

Several of the schools, such as Gwynedd-Mercy College, Trinity College in Vermont, and Marymount Manhattan College, are examining how to improve the educational experiences of all students through curriculum revisions. Others, including East Carolina University and DePaul University, are addressing the concerns of particular groups of students.

Project Lodestar: Realistically Assessing the Future By Peggy Brown, Editor

In its final report, *Three Thousand Futures*, the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education reminds educators that "Looking ahead is not just a matter of curiosity. It is also a matter of effective adaptation... (and) leadership, of trying to seize hold of the future and to guide it, and not just to react to what otherwise will happen." As colleges and universities enter the decade of the 80s they are finding that the reality of the present often limits their view of the future to the one exigency that is always with them: their financial state of affairs. While administrators recognize such issues as vocationalism versus liberal education, freedom of course selection versus institutional requirements, and classroom learning versus educational technology, they sometimes limit their discussions of these subjects to how each will affect their school's budget and resources.

AAC President Mark Curtis addressed this issue in his opening remarks at the 1981 AAC Annual Meeting in Denver. He urged his colleagues to recognize that the "bottom line" for the survival of colleges and universities is not their financial condition but rather their ability to restore coherence and quality to liberal education. While Dr. Curtis is fully cognizant of the costs of financing higher education he fears that excessive attention to such matters will further impede the mission of each institution.

Administrators must then confront the future with an understanding of where they are heading and how they can maintain their educational mission in the face of social and economic change. Project Lodestar was developed by AAC to provide new directions for institutions seeking guidance in academic planning and curriculum evaluation. The Association selected a quote from educator and sociologist David Riesman as the theme of the project: "The

This publication is made possible by a grant from
the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

small steps we take must be guided by the larger vision, as the navigators of an earlier era guided themselves by the North Star while adapting their momentary seamanship to the winds and currents around them."

...

In 1979 AAC issued a comprehensive agenda establishing the Association's priorities and goals. Titled "The Task at Hand," the report includes as missions of AAC the enhancement and promotion of humane and liberating learning and the strengthening of member institutions as settings for such learning. Project Lodestar was created to fulfill that mission by aiding colleges and universities in the assessment of institutional missions and goals, administrative structures, and overall curriculum.

To provide this assessment, AAC sends teams of consultants to member institutions requesting assistance in evaluating current programs, planning future strategies, or translating goals into action. Lodestar schools are chosen by AAC in a competitive application process. A generous grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation has allowed AAC to offer the consultants to schools willing to pay 50 percent of the cost of the services. In the original design of the project, applicants selected one of two types of teams: institutional advisory consultants skilled in planning and academic administration and liberal learning advisory consultants familiar with curriculum evaluation and development. By the end of the pilot phase of the project in September 1980, AAC realized that it was not possible to neatly separate the issues concerning schools today into institutional development problems or liberal learning problems. Because each area affects the other, the Association no longer requests that schools focus on just one concern.

The consultation process begins with the initial visit of the lead consultant at the Lodestar schools. His or her job is to talk with faculty and administrators about the problems addressed in their application and to determine what needs to be done and in what areas the consultants should be expert. During the pilot phase of Project Lodestar, from October 1979 to September 1980, AAC staff members operated as lead consultants. During the rest of the project, AAC has and will employ lead consultants from outside the AAC staff. Lead consultants for the 1980-81 project year were Paula Brownlee, then on leave as dean of faculty, Union College and now president of Hollins College; Evan Collins, professor of higher education administration, Boston College and professor emeritus, State University of New York at Albany; and John Moseley, chancellor, Austin College and director of its Center for Program and Institutional Renewal. The lead consultants provide on-going contact with the project institutions and operate as extensions of the AAC staff. Their value is enhanced by their own campus background and expertise.

In both the pilot phase and first year activities the AAC staff and lead consultants discovered that often the issues presented in a school's application are not the concerns that need immediate attention. The pressures to survive are very great, according to Dr. Moseley, and tend to create a "tunnel vision" among administrators and faculty that limits their ability to recognize the issues around them and anticipate the long-range implications of their immediate actions. "The problem defined may be an annoying one," Moseley says, "or one that seems to fit into the Lodestar program, or it may be just the tip of the iceberg of

something much more fundamental going on in the college." This last situation was apparent in Dr. Moseley's initial visit with Saint John's University and the College of Saint Benedict. Although administrators had requested assistance in determining tenure practices for departments jointly run by both schools, Moseley realized that all of the schools' cooperative agreements needed examination and possible revision. By offering some insights into the real problems facing the schools, Moseley was able to reveal to administrators the underlying causes of their tenure frustrations and change the focus of their Lodestar project.

The assessment of each school's concerns, either explicitly stated in their application or underlying the outward symptoms manifested at the institution, involves careful study. The lead consultants examine materials such as enrollment statistics, college brochures and catalogs, and internal and external reports and talk with various faculty and staff. In discussions with each school, AAC and the lead consultants select appropriate team members to address different facets of the school's concerns. For a review of Trinity's 10-year-old open curriculum, AAC chose consultants from Amherst and Bowdoin, two schools with enrollments, administrations, and missions similar to Trinity's. To assist in determining how Hartwick College might approach academic planning which anticipated future demographic realities, AAC appointed three consultants, each with expertise applicable to one cluster of Hartwick's disciplines. AAC does not maintain a set roster of consultants but rather searches for the best consultants to suit each circumstance.

By employing the team approach to consultation, AAC is able to provide schools with a variety of perspectives. While even one outsider examining what is going on at a school is valuable, several consultants provide a further exchange of ideas and beliefs and build on and define each others' recommendations. In describing the team approach Dr. Brownlee says, "By sharing experiences and outlooks the analysis goes much faster and more creatively. Every consultant I worked with agreed that the concept of a team consultants'hip was an excellent one which yielded far better results than when the consultants worked as individuals. That is, the team was much more than the sum of the parts!"

As the pilot phase and first year activities progressed it became clear that many of the schools were examining similar concerns, although the symptoms of the problems and the solutions were different. For example, both Birmingham-Southern College and Hartwick College are determining how their curricula can best reflect the missions of the schools. Birmingham-Southern originally asked for assistance in reviewing their two-year-old divisional structure while Hartwick administrators requested guidance in implementing a college-wide set of plans. In discussions with their lead consultants both schools recognized that their curricula needed attention before the other proposals could be put in operation. Hartwick is studying its curriculum by creating faculty experts on each department. Members of its Faculty Council are assigned to departments other than their own to conduct reviews of the departments' staffing needs, current courses and faculty, and relationship to similar departments at other colleges. At Birmingham-Southern, faculty task forces are concentrating on various aspects of the college's five-year academic plan. During division meetings faculty are dis-

cussing how to plan and implement an interdisciplinary curriculum.

By learning what are successful approaches to reviewing curriculum and conducting a self-study, AAC hopes to develop a guide for examining the mission and curriculum needs of various types of institutions. This compilation of techniques would assist schools which did not participate in Project Lodestar in looking ahead and realistically planning how to continue their mission. In summarizing the benefits of Project Lodestar John Moseley says, "For the college that is really serious about facing the future, Lodestar is a pathway from survival to educational leadership."

...

During Summer 1981 AAC is reviewing Project Lodestar applications for 1981-82 consultations. Assisting in this review is the Association's Commission on Curriculum and Faculty Development. AAC has now implemented a two-stage application process. Semi-finalists are chosen by the staff based on the initial applications. AAC staff and lead consultants visit the semi-finalist schools to clarify the nature of the consultation request, determine the types of consultants needed, and establish a tentative timetable. After this process has been completed, AAC and the schools will decide if they wish to make a commitment to the project. Individual institutions pay 50 percent of the cost of the consultation services, which are estimated to range between \$2,000 and \$4,000, depending upon the size of the advisory team, the number of visits, and the nature of the problem. The application deadline for consultations during the 1982-83 project year will be announced in early 1982. Persons interested in learning more about Project Lodestar or receiving a copy of the application form may contact William R. O'Connell, Jr., vice president for programs at AAC.

Birmingham-Southern College

Academic Divisions and Curriculum Planning

In an effort to increase management effectiveness and to encourage interdisciplinary program development, Birmingham-Southern College created six interdisciplinary academic divisions in 1978 to replace the school's previous 18 traditional departments. The divisions are fine and performing arts, sciences and mathematics, humanities, behavioral and social sciences, business administration and economics, and education. The Division of Humanities, for example, includes the old departments of history, religion, English, philosophy, foreign languages, and classics. Each division is administered by a department chairperson and disciplines are called the faculty, rather than the department, of that discipline. A seventh division, adult studies and special programs, was added in 1980.

Two years after the establishment of the six interdisciplinary divisions, Birmingham-Southern administrators applied to Project Lodestar for assistance in refining the new system and in providing management training to division chairpersons. In their Lodestar application, the authors cited some of the situations that prompted the creation of the divisional system. They recalled the com-

munication and management difficulties in coordinating the 18-department structure and the lack of interdisciplinary programs. At the divisional system's two-year mark, the administration believed it was time for outside evaluators to review the program.

AAC approved Birmingham-Southern's application and appointed John Moseley, chancellor, Austin College and executive director of its Center for Program and Institutional Renewal, as lead consultant. Moseley visited the college in fall 1980 to review the divisional structure and to discuss in greater detail with administrators and division chairpersons the types of consultants best suited to their needs. During this consultation, the college also shared a draft of its proposed five-year academic plan. This plan recommended various interdisciplinary program and course developments and revisions and possible increases in the size of the faculty. In their discussions, Moseley and the college staff realized that the divisional structure review had to be considered in conjunction with the five-year plan. The school and AAC adjusted the Lodestar focus to include first the curriculum planning and development issues and second the division administration.

AAC selected four additional consultants to assist in Birmingham-Southern's Lodestar project: Bruce Haywood, president, Monmouth College; William Adams, program manager for graduate and postdoctoral programs, National Science Foundation; John McConahay, associate professor of public policy and psychology and associate director of the Institute for Policy Studies, Duke University; and Harriet Sheridan, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Brown University. In February 1981 the five consultants visited the campus for three days, one of which was devoted to a faculty seminar. Haywood addressed the entire faculty on the necessity for looking toward a less traditional department/disciplinary structure than that found at most institutions. After his presentation the faculty met in three groups, each with the consultant most closely related to their areas of specialization, to discuss interdisciplinary curriculum planning.

After the consultation, the college formed a steering committee to coordinate further review activities. The committee developed 15 task forces to examine facets of the five-year plan. The task forces, which will begin their work after a faculty institute in September, will be concentrating on such curricular issues as international studies, values-oriented teaching, general education, freshman orientation, and honors programs.

In May 1981 Moseley met again with the division chairpersons and W. Edmund Moomaw, vice president for academic affairs and dean, to discuss their Lodestar project's original focus: the management and administration of the division system. He conducted workshops on program administration, division management, educational planning, and personnel development.

As plans are made for the task forces to formally begin their assignments, Birmingham-Southern administrators are excited about the curriculum revisions and the further refinement of the division structure which they anticipate will result from their reviews of the five-year plan. With funds from a Mellon Foundation faculty development grant, the task forces will study the issues during the 1981-82 year and report their findings to the faculty in spring 1982.

Moomaw is convinced that small liberal arts colleges have made a mistake in emulating the departmental struc-

ture of large universities. To better serve students and society he calls for the adoption of a division system similar to Birmingham-Southern's program. Project Lodestar, according to Moomaw, has provided the opportunity for Birmingham-Southern to assess and strengthen the two-year-old academic organization which he believes can best provide integrated, interdisciplinary learning experiences.

For more information, contact:

W. Edmund Moomaw
Vice President for Academic Affairs and
Dean of the College
Birmingham-Southern College
800 8th Avenue West
Birmingham, AL 35204
(205) 328-5250, ext. 200

Sonoma State University

New Developments in Graduate Studies

In the mid-1970s, Sonoma State University initiated an internal evaluation of its graduate program that produced a report entitled "A Status Report on Graduate Education at California State College, Sonoma in 1976-77." This report pinpointed graduate enrollment trends as a potentially decisive factor in curricular planning. For example, although the report noted that overall graduate enrollment had been increasing steadily for five years, it also indicated that enrollment in certain programs, such as history, mathematics, and physical education, had been decreasing. These enrollment statistics merited consideration by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) which, at the university's request, conducted an external evaluation of the graduate program at Sonoma State. The WASC report suggested that Sonoma State review its graduate program, with the aim of eliminating programs with relatively low enrollment and developing new programs to meet students' needs.

As part of their graduate program review process, Sonoma State administrators participated in the AAC Lodestar pilot program. Thus, the administrators asked Lodestar consultants Donald Castleberry, retired dean of Graduate Studies, San Francisco State University; Stanley Manahan, professor of chemistry, University of Missouri-Columbia; and Roger Peterson, tutor, St. John's College, to suggest curricular changes that would either lead to a more balanced distribution of students throughout each degree program, or would attract new students to the university.

The Lodestar consultants each worked individually on a particular program. For various reasons, the Lodestar consultation proved more effective in some areas than in others. For example, Sonoma State administrators initially had hoped to develop an MA program in liberal studies, housed by their Hutchins School of Liberal Studies. Development of such a program progressed slowly, however, partly because it strained the resources of the Hutchins School. This school had received full responsibility for Sonoma State's teacher certification program just one year before the Lodestar consultation began. Consequently, plans for the development of an MA program in liberal studies had to be postponed.

Lodestar consultation in other areas led to more immediate results. Castleberry's review of the MA program

in management and the MA program in political science emphasized the advantages of a close collaboration between those two departments. Such advantages include the shared use of faculty resources within the two departments, and the possibility of designing collaborative courses in areas such as public administration. Although no collaborative courses have been designed as yet, the idea of developing a close working relationship between the management and political science departments has been accepted by Sonoma State.

Sonoma State has also decided to create an interdisciplinary MS program in environmental science. In fact, the proposed program has been approved by Sonoma State's Board of Trustees and the California Post-secondary Education Commission for probable implementation in fall 1982. Plans for this program resulted from meetings of a planning committee consisting of Lodestar consultant Manahan and interested faculty from the university's geology, chemistry, and physics departments. Reports from these meetings presented many strong reasons for the implementation of an MS program in environmental science at Sonoma State. Some of these reasons stress an improved use of faculty resources; the university has an appropriately well-qualified faculty in the natural sciences. Other reasons focus on Sonoma State's commitment to its surrounding regions. Because these regions will probably experience increased development in the next few years, local industries and government agencies will need students trained in solving problems stemming from use of the environment, energy, and natural resources. In addition, these industries and government agencies will make new students and potential funding available to the university.

For these compelling reasons, the planning committee proposed an overall design for the MS program in environmental science. The program will offer options under a dual-track system, administered by the geology, chemistry, and physics departments. The first track will emphasize disciplinary studies in either of the three departments, while the second track will emphasize applied studies in topics such as geothermal energy, environmental monitoring instrumentation, or wastewater renovation and utilization. Both of these tracks will require a thesis dealing with some aspect of environmental science, such as geologic hazards, geothermal resources, wastewater recycling, water and soil chemistry, and toxicology. In addition to disciplinary and interdisciplinary courses, the program will offer internships at cooperating local industries and government agencies. Through such internships, students will gain practical experience in their chosen field.

According to Ardath Lee, acting dean of graduate studies and research, the proposed MS program in environmental science constitutes the most immediately beneficial result of the Lodestar pilot consultation at Sonoma State. In reference to the Lodestar consultation as a whole, she claims it had an "extremely positive, catalytic effect" on curricular planning in the graduate program.

For more information, contact:

Ardath Lee
Acting Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
Sonoma State University
Rohnert Park, CA 94928
(707) 664-2114

College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University

Inter-institutional Cooperation

The year 1953 marked the beginning of the cooperative institutional activities that have continued between the College of St. Benedict and St. John's University since that time. Located within five miles of each other, the two institutions share a common purpose: to provide a quality, undergraduate liberal arts education in a Christian, Catholic, and Benedictine context. Their relationship has evolved from an informal faculty exchange to cooperative and joint academic departments and from consideration of a legal merger to a policy of institutional coordination between separate colleges.

St. John's University was chartered in 1857 as St. John's Seminary and is the oldest continuous higher education institution in Minnesota. Today the university enrolls 1,820 men and has a full-time equivalent faculty of 119. The College of St. Benedict, established in 1913, has grown from a girls' school offering college courses to a liberal arts college with 1,818 undergraduate women and 107 full-time equivalent faculty.

The historical autonomy of the two institutions has caused problems during the last few years as the academic deans try to project staffing needs for the joint departments. These departments are chaired by faculty from either campus on an alternating schedule and include the departments of biology, history, mathematics, music, and sociology. Because the tenure policies and practices at each school differ, faculty are frustrated by what they view as an inequitable tenure policy in determining joint department staffing. It was this concern that prompted the two institutions to submit a joint application for the Project Lodestar advisory services.

AAC asked John Moseley, chancellor, Austin College and executive director of its Center for Program and Institutional Renewal, to examine the situation at the schools and make recommendations for resolving the tenure problems. Moseley began his Project Lodestar consultation with campus visits to discuss the project concerns and strategies. Through conversations with administrators at both schools, Moseley realized that the tenure issue was merely a symptom of the difficulties of cooperation rather than the problem itself. Acting on this assumption, the colleges, with AAC concurring, permitted Moseley to widen the consultation focus to include the study of all basic relations and agreements between the two schools.

During the second phase of the consultation process Moseley and school administrators collected as much information as possible documenting the various cooperative relationships. This material included reports, agreements, and a specially prepared index annotating the nature of each cooperative program and operation. With the assistance of Glenn Bucher, a College of Wooster faculty member on leave to work at the Austin Center during 1980-81, Moseley prepared a preliminary analysis of the schools' structures and needs and proposed options for change.

Moseley and Bucher next visited the campuses to review the preliminary report and interview faculty members. These discussions clarified the general directions that the final report would take and further identified some of the problems surrounding the personnel issues.

Moseley, Bucher, and staff at the Austin Center for Program and Institutional Renewal prepared a 30-page report titled "Institutional Cooperation, Policy Issues, Organizational Options, and the Implications for Academic Personnel Policy." In their report, the consultants summarize their findings, provide analyses of the schools' current relationships, and offer three options for facilitating cooperation while maintaining the distinctiveness of each institution. Moseley and Bucher note that in the past many of the cooperative agreements between the schools have been based on mutual trust and not on definitive policy. Cooperative arrangements, according to the consultants, need some formal structure that defines the policies of the joint agreements and takes into account the legal implications of all decisions. Moseley suggests a separate entity be created with the authority to plan, approve, implement, coordinate, and evaluate these operations. The consultants' proposed conceptual models offer various structures for solving the schools' administrative and personnel problems. Included are suggestions on how decisions might be made at various levels, how operational efficiency might be increased, and how the distinctiveness of each institution might be maintained.

Administrators from St. John's University and the College of St. Benedict are studying the consultants' final report. In addition, they are continuing to review the implications of instituting similar or differing personnel policies at each of the schools. In February 1982 each school's board of trustees will review the final report and the suggested options.

Sister Linda Kulzer, College of St. Benedict vice president for academic affairs, reports that Project Lodestar made it possible for the two institutions to receive expert advice on an issue that otherwise might not have come to the surface. She says that at times the consultants and administrators were frustrated that the study was no longer focused on the problem that had been highlighted in the original application. But, Kulzer concludes, the consultants helped the schools realize that the tenure problems must be viewed in the context of the cooperative arrangements, and they provided new insights into the present situation as well as stimulating creative thinking about the future.

For more information, contact:
Sister Linda Kulzer
Vice President for Academic Affairs
College of St. Benedict
St. Joseph, MN 56374
(612) 363-5401

Rutgers University, University College-Newark

Restructuring the General Education Curriculum

University College-Newark is one of three semi-autonomous units created when the Rutgers University state-wide evening college for adults was restructured in 1978. Called University Colleges, the three units now have control over their own curricular decisions while continuing to operate under the budgetary authority of the

original evening college system. The other University College units are located in New Brunswick and Camden.

The organizational changes were prompted by increased enrollments in the 37-year-old evening college. As a result of the restructuring, University College-Newark found itself with its own academic and administrative officers, but without its own curriculum particularly suited to its own students' needs.

These new needs resulted mainly from the college's determination to unite its traditional liberal arts curriculum, relatively small faculty, and non-traditional student body into a coherent whole more suited to the school's increased independence. Presently, the college offers its students a traditional liberal arts curriculum which it inherited from the original large University College system. Because University College employed a state-wide faculty, its original Newark branch could offer courses in 36 subjects and degrees in 16 subjects. After the changes of 1978, however, University College-Newark no longer had access to this state-wide faculty. Consequently, the college now offers a liberal arts curriculum that demands an unreasonable amount of time and energy from its 39 full-time and 80 part-time faculty members.

In addition to this imbalance between curricular demands and faculty numbers, the University College-Newark planners must deal with the special needs of a non-traditional student body. For example, 75 percent of the college's student body is 25 or older, 55 percent is Black or Hispanic, and 85 percent is enrolled on a part-time basis. Many of the University College-Newark students come from poor, urban neighborhoods in the surrounding area. Because most of the students work full-time and take evening classes in order to advance their careers in business, nearly 60 to 70 percent of the students enroll in business courses. This preponderance of business majors limits the scope and vitality of the liberal arts departments, such as philosophy and history, according to Charles Nanry, dean.

Realizing that steps must be taken toward the creation of a viable general education curriculum, University College-Newark planners first restructured the existing 17 departments into three manageable academic divisions: Humanities, Applied Social Science, and Administration Studies. These divisions may be changed again, but they now enjoy departmental powers. The college also arranged, through a cooperative agreement, to have some evening classes taught to its students by faculty of the Newark College of Arts and Sciences, an undergraduate day college. After taking these initial steps, the college planners arranged a series of meetings with AAC Lodestar consultants Evan R. Collins, professor of higher education administration at Boston College and former president of State University of New York at Albany; P. Douglas Kindschi, dean of Kirkhof College of Grand Valley State Colleges in Michigan; and Francis Broderick, professor of history, University of Massachusetts, Boston, in order to clarify further the college's curricular plans.

At the Lodestar consultants' suggestion, the University College-Newark Planning Committee composed a report entitled, "Proposed Outcomes for Student Education at University College-Newark." These "proposed outcomes" include student understanding of at least one of the physical sciences, mathematics, Western culture, cultural differences, forms of writing, art history, western literature, how communities develop, and faculty-student relation-

ships. From this report came specific suggestions on how to tailor the general education curriculum to fit the Planning Committee's goals.

One proposal involves the creation of a basic course in academic study skills in order to develop the self-confidence and skills of the college's many students who lack necessary knowledge about learning tools. The proposed course would offer instruction in major sources of current information, the use of the library, study habits, note-taking, classroom participation, and the structure of the college and university. The Planning Committee and Lodestar consultants hope that such a course will increase students' success in other general education courses.

These general education courses are still being discussed and developed by University College-Newark planners. Nonetheless, the college administrators expressed great satisfaction with the college's organizational progress in general and the Lodestar consultation project in particular. Partly as a result of the Lodestar consultation, the college has planned its first faculty retreat, scheduled for fall 1981. During this retreat, faculty will reach specific decisions about the college's new general education curriculum.

For more information, contact:

Charles Nanry

Dean

University College-Newark

Room 419 Hill Hall

Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey

Newark, NJ 07102

(201) 648-5833

Trinity College (VT) *General Education Planning*

In early 1980, with technical assistance from the Academy for Educational Development, Trinity College completed designing a comprehensive five-year plan, which included a review of the entire curriculum. As one of the assumptions of the plan was the implementation of a college-wide general education program by 1984, the college chose to develop a general education core as the priority project in the curriculum review.

In March 1980 Trinity College applied to the Project Lodestar advisory services for assistance in translating the goal of general education into reality at the college. The school wanted to replace the 30-hour distribution requirement, which was not applied equally to the undergraduates from each of Trinity's three diverse student populations: traditional students, non-traditional students in the Weekend College, and non-traditional students in the weekday program. Although traditional and Weekend College students were required to complete the distribution courses, non-traditional students in the weekday program were exempt from the requirement with some minor exceptions.

AAC approved Trinity's application and appointed Evan Collins, professor of higher education administra-

tion, Boston College and president emeritus of the State University of New York at Albany, as lead consultant. The ultimate goal of the project was to replace the distribution requirement with common educational experiences for traditional and non-traditional students alike. Collins met first with Michael Donnellan, academic dean, in Boston to discuss the focus of the project and later with Trinity's departmental chairpersons attending AAC's General Education Workshop in November 1980. The departmental chairpersons each head one of Trinity's five academic units: basic and social sciences, business and economics, education, humanities, and natural science/mathematics. The general education workshop, according to Donnellan, provided the ideal occasion for the departmental chairpersons to receive in-service training in general education. At the conclusion of the workshop, the chairpersons met with Collins and Lodestar consultant Carol Guardo, provost, University of Hartford, to pinpoint the critical general education issues at Trinity. The combined workshop and Lodestar consultation, according to Donnellan, informed and stimulated the chairpersons.

Upon their return to campus, each chairperson began developing a list of the anticipated outcomes of his or her department's contribution to general education. At a final consultation in March, Collins and consultant Robert Hatala, dean of arts and sciences, University of Southern Maine, met with the faculty to discuss Trinity's decision to explore general education from a departmental perspective rather than across disciplinary lines. The faculty chose the Educational Policies Council (EPC) to establish a time line for activities and clarify the departmental outcomes. EPC is an elected committee of faculty members whose primary focus is curriculum matters. EPC reports to the faculty at large each month.

At the May faculty meeting it was decided to create an ad hoc committee on general education to report to the EPC. Although the ad hoc committee will not formally begin work until fall 1981, several members have met with the EPC chairperson to draft a proposal for a curriculum grant based on the Lodestar experience. One day at the annual week-long faculty workshop in the fall will be devoted to the topic of general education. At that time faculty will make suggestions to the ad hoc committee on how to proceed with the further development of general education at Trinity. The ad hoc committee will look over the departmental outcomes and synthesize these as college learning outcomes.

Donnellan anticipates that the ad hoc committee will develop a set of common educational outcomes that will be appropriate for one or more models of general education. He recognizes that the college may need to accept the idea that a single model of general education may not realistically provide general education to Trinity's three diverse student populations.

Donnellan calls Project Lodestar one of the building blocks Trinity has used in creating or implementing its five-year plan. Trinity linked Project Lodestar with a number of other projects focusing on the curriculum. Lodestar helped Trinity clarify its thinking and sharpen its focus, according to Donnellan, and provided outsiders, with no ostensible bias, to examine the college's situation. He is especially pleased that the departmental chairpersons were able to meet with Lodestar consultants immediately following the General Education Workshop, and says it is

valuable for faculty to leave campus and devote time together to a particular topic.

For more information, contact:

Michael Donnellan
Academic Dean
Trinity College
208 Colchester Avenue
Burlington, VT 05401
(802) 658-0337, ext. 179

DePaul University *Inter-institutional Relationships and Transfer Student Articulation*

When an internal study revealed that many of their transfer students were performing at marginal levels, DePaul University administrators recognized that something had to be done to improve the students' chances for academic success. Located in Chicago, DePaul accepts transfer students from a number of area community colleges. During the 1978-1979 school year, for example, 1,584 freshmen entered DePaul while 1,403 students transferred to the university.

Early in 1980 AAC invited DePaul University to participate in the pilot phase of Project Lodestar and receive assistance in dealing with various aspects of their articulation problems. DePaul administrators identified two objectives which they felt would have a positive effect on transfer students' academic careers. The first was the development of strategies for establishing a continuing dialogue with feeder community colleges on how to improve potential transfer students' writing and mathematics skills. The second objective was the development of a specific plan on how to extend DePaul's advising system to all transfer students, many of whom needed special attention due to their poor skills. AAC recommended two consultants who could help DePaul formulate strategies for achieving these objectives: Donald Barshis, dean for faculty development for the City Wide College System of Chicago and Duane Anderson, director of Community College Affairs at the University of Iowa.

Prior to participation in the Lodestar project, administrators had developed a new curriculum which emphasized flexibility in designing bachelors degree programs. This new curriculum continues the tradition of providing a quality education in both basic skills and general education. To assist in the accurate placement of freshman students, the university administers three assessment examinations prior to fall registration: an entry-level writing evaluation, a diagnostic mathematics test, and a computational skills inventory test. Faculty advisers, specially selected by department chairpersons and the dean of assessment and admissions for their skill, interest, and availability, receive a computer printout with a brief profile on each entering freshman. The reports include DePaul assessment and ACT scores, recommendations for all entrance level courses in writing and mathematics, and biographical data. With information gathered through Project Lodestar on the special needs and concerns of transfers, administrators hoped to extend the assessment and advising system to this growing number of DePaul students.

DePaul administrators initiated the work on Project Lodestar by forming two implementation committees. The Community College Liaison Group was charged with initiating and developing communication channels between DePaul and area community colleges. The responsibilities of the Skills Advisement Group included informing university faculty and staff of the skills development problems of certain racial and ethnic student populations in the Chicago Community College System.

As part of the consultation process, Barshis and Anderson met with DePaul faculty and staff and community college representatives to discuss the transfer students' academic problems. Barshis presented overviews of Chicago's student population and its remediation problems, and community college faculty described their experiences teaching reading and writing to skills-deficient students. Edward Allemand, dean of undergraduate assessment and admissions and Project Lodestar coordinator, describes one faculty conference as an "eye-opening" experience. One of Allemand's concerns at the beginning of the project was the naiveté of DePaul's faculty regarding the problems of transfer students. Barshis was able to increase their understanding by describing the goals and aspirations, educational desires, and mathematics and writing skills of the students coming out of the Chicago school system.

By relating some of his experiences with articulation between community colleges and four-year institutions in the Iowa system, Anderson was able to suggest some strategies for faculty development at DePaul. Administrators particularly were concerned with how to inform faculty of the demands that will result from the increased emphasis on transfer students.

Beginning in the summer 1981 all transfer students at DePaul will participate in the skills assessment system and the faculty advising program. The regularly scheduled faculty advising workshop will now include materials profiling transfer students and their specific problems and needs. The insights garnered on the transfer population during the Project Lodestar conferences will prove extremely valuable to the faculty advisers, says Allemand. The advisers will have a clearer understanding of whom they are talking to when they begin advising the transfers.

Allemand is pleased with DePaul's participation in Project Lodestar. He notes that the increased communication between the university and community colleges has been important in dispelling clichés that faculty and staff at both schools had about each other. By presenting faculty with the reality of the community college situation and the transfer students' problems, Allemand believes an institutional awareness was created that will shape people's thinking and, in turn, benefit the students.

For more information, contact:
L. Edward Allemand
Dean, Undergraduate Assessment and Admissions
DePaul University
25 East Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, IL 60604
(312) 321-7600

Marymount Manhattan College *Development of Interdisciplinary Seminars*

In an effort to make Marymount Manhattan's liberal arts offerings a structured program rather than a series of elective courses, the Committee on Curriculum, in 1978, designed a 60-credit general liberal arts program. This program recommended that students take 12 credits in each of the five liberal arts areas: human nature, knowledge and values; the natural world; the human community; the creative imagination: language and literature; and the creative imagination: aural, visual, and kinetic art.

To supplement this program, college administrators applied for help from Project Lodestar in developing a series of coordinating seminars that would correspond to each of the five areas. This original application stressed the need for five seminars that would synthesize, or integrate, the courses offered by the general liberal arts program.

This plan of designing five synthesizing seminars proved overly ambitious, however. After two visits in November and December 1980 from Paula Brownlee, lead Lodestar consultant and then on leave as dean of faculty, Union College, the interested group of faculty and administrative planners decided that the nature of the college's student body precluded the implementation of synthesizing seminars. The fact that over 50 percent of Marymount Manhattan students are enrolled on a part-time basis, and therefore may not have taken similar courses, undermines the effectiveness of seminars geared toward integrating previous course work. Thus, it was agreed that the faculty planning group would focus its efforts on the development of two or three well-organized interdisciplinary seminars.

For advice on the development of these seminars, the planning group enlisted two Lodestar consultants: M. Andrew Murray, director, Peace and Conflict Studies, Juanita College; and John Groppe, professor of English, St. Joseph's College. These two consultants and Brownlee met with faculty planners in March 1981. As a result of that meeting, Murray began an individual consultation with the professor of the proposed "War and Peace" seminar, while Groppe offered his services to the professor responsible for the "Language, Myth, and Symbol" seminar.

These individual consultations produced well-organized course outlines. The "War and Peace" seminar, to be taught by a coordinator and guest lecturers, will discuss issues such as the causes, morality, prevention, and consequences of war; the nature of modern warfare; and prospects and problems of the future. The other seminar "Language, Myth, and Symbol," will cross disciplinary lines as it seeks to acquaint students with relationships between language, myth, and symbol. The seminar will examine phonetic and semantic definitions and functions of language; general, literary, and philosophical definitions of myth; and Erich Fromm's categories of symbols.

The development of these two seminars comprises only part of the planning group's goal of designing five interdisciplinary seminars. For example, the group hopes that an additional seminar, "Believing and Behaving," will receive help from a Lodestar consultant next year. Presently, the faculty planning group foresees implementing five interdisciplinary seminars by spring 1982.

Joe Clancy, professor of English and theatre, and the college's Lodestar planning coordinator, comments that in addition to offering advice on the interdisciplinary seminars, the Lodestar consultants served as a "goad" toward

better organization within the college's planning committees. The planning committees had not met regularly prior to the Lodestar consultation. Results of a June 1981 meeting of the Lodestar planning group, however, included an agenda for fall planning by an organized subcommittee on interdisciplinary seminars, and a clarified statement of objectives that places the seminars within the conceptual framework of the college's general liberal arts program.

For more information, contact:

Joe Clancy

Professor of English and Theatre

Marymount Manhattan College

221 E. 71 Street

New York, NY 10021

(212) 472-3800

Elon College

General Education Review

During the past twenty years Elon College administrators have noted a shift in academic emphasis from liberal arts majors to career-oriented programs. This shift has resulted in a decrease in the numbers of students taking upper-level liberal arts courses and necessitated the inclusion of most of the school's liberal arts goals within the general education requirements. Faculty and staff have spent the last three years examining Elon's academic program. Recognizing that the general education requirement, which would continue to contain the core of the liberal arts program for all students, is a critical concern at Elon, administrators applied to Project Lodestar for aid in conducting a general education review.

AAC approved Elon's Lodestar application and the college's vice president for academic and student affairs appointed an ad hoc committee on general education. The committee, composed of faculty, students, and administrators, broadened its charge to include a reexamination of Elon's educational mission and a study of the general education curriculum with the idea of recommending possible revision.

In August 1980 the committee met with Lodestar consultant Jerry Gaff, director of the Project on General Education Models (GEM), to organize its plan of action. Although the committee had not yet begun to function as a group, his guidance proved useful in communicating to faculty and staff the enormity of the task they were about to undertake. Gaff stressed the need for a realistic time line and convinced administrators of the necessity of providing release time to key faculty members.

The real kickoff for the Lodestar project, according to Ann Ponder, director of the Honors Program and assistant professor of English, was AAC's October 1980 General Education Workshop in Charlotte, which the committee attended. After the workshop, Ponder was appointed chairperson of the general education committee, and the group's working relationships began to coalesce.

During the fall and early spring the committee surveyed the philosophical questions behind general education models from a range of objectives including modes of learning and modes of development. Several members of the committee examined the mission statements of institutions similar to Elon and compared how those institutions' general education requirements measured up to the schools' missions. Other committee members prepared a report on the past and present state of Elon's general

education program and hypothesized what should be done.

The committee shared its findings at an April 1981 meeting with Lodestar consultants Clifton Conrad, associate professor of education, College of William and Mary, and Susan Wittig, dean, Newcomb College, Tulane University. In discussions with the consultants the committee was able to clarify the educational philosophy at Elon and identify more clearly the areas that needed attention. The committee charged a number of members with working together to develop a working draft on general education to present to the faculty during the 1981-82 academic year.

The working draft, completed by committee members in June, contains four sections. The first, a statement of the purpose of general education at Elon, includes the following proposals for the college's program: 1) place general education in a developmental perspective which takes into consideration the shifts in students' levels of cognitive and moral development over their four years; 2) make a clear distinction between the functions of general education and the functions of education in a student's major; 3) strengthen the general education component of the curriculum; and 4) integrate Elon's mission statement throughout the entire curriculum.

The second section of the working draft lists three specific models of general education for the faculty to debate. The third offers a description of two new general education components which the committee would like to implement: general education seminars and the provision of cultural literacy. In the fourth section the committee provides a plan for implementing their general education proposals.

Ponder anticipates scheduling telephone conferences for late August to discuss the committee's working draft with several consultants. By sending the report and a list of questions they would like to have answered prior to the call, the committee hopes to save time and money by having the draft critiqued by phone.

During the 1981-82 year the committee will present its working draft to the faculty. The year-long discussions of general education will begin with a visit by Lodestar consultant Arthur Levine, senior fellow, Carnegie Council for the Advancement of Teaching. Levine will present the concepts of general education at a faculty meeting and participate in a forum on the topic. The committee, says Ponder, met Levine at the General Education Workshop and is pleased to be able to have him address the entire faculty.

Other activities designed to familiarize the faculty with the committee's draft include a series of luncheons with faculty groups from representative disciplines, visits by committee members to the departments, and one-on-one sessions with key faculty. In late fall Wittig will return to Elon to participate in further faculty discussions. The committee admires Wittig's professional style, says Ponder, and believes she will be an asset in answering difficult questions which arise during faculty debate of the general education revisions.

By late spring 1982 Ponder hopes to have an informal faculty commitment to the working draft. After conducting a year of test pilots using the proposed general education models, the committee will ask for a formal faculty vote approving the curriculum changes.

In assessing what has been accomplished thus far, Ponder states that even if no changes are made in the cur-

riculum the project is successful because the committee has clarified Elon's academic program with its statement of purpose. She notes that an additional benefit of Project Lodestar is the educational process of the review. The committee, she says, has been enlivened by dynamic interactions between its members and by the sharing of disciplinary and theoretical perspectives.

For more information, contact:

Ann Ponder
Assistant Professor of English
Elon College
Elon College, NC 27244
(919) 584-2225

Trinity College (CT) *Curriculum Review*

A free-elective curriculum has been in operation at Trinity College since 1969 when the faculty voted to change the established format of major requirements, distribution courses, and electives. Trinity students enroll in specific required courses only in their major field of study; they are free to choose whatever other courses they wish to complement their studies. Although there are no general education or distribution requirements, advisers recommend that students include courses from four guideline areas: language and other symbolic systems, natural and physical sciences, social institutions, and cultural expressions.

Ten years after this new curriculum had been in place, Theodore Lockwood, Trinity president, recommended to the staff and faculty that it was time to re-examine the college's open curriculum policy. He cited the need to determine how current students' wants compared with the faculty's perceptions of the undergraduates' needs and questioned whether or not the current curriculum was providing students with an understanding of such issues as the world in which they live, their own culture, the complexities of contemporary society, and the intellectual resiliency and moral stamina necessary to exist. To supplement his recommendations, Lockwood commissioned four faculty members to write papers discussing their views of the curriculum, its rationale and objectives, and its future. Lockwood's report, together with the commissioned papers, motivated the March 1980 faculty vote establishing an ad hoc committee on curriculum review. The faculty charged the committee with spending the next year reviewing the open curriculum policy and reporting its findings to the Trinity Curriculum Committee for submission to the faculty by April 1981.

At the beginning of its study, the committee determined that it would be seeking the answers to two fundamental questions: Is the open curriculum as inherently deserving as its proponents believe and have societal changes affected the 10-year-old curriculum's ability to meet the needs of today's students. After initial discussions between committee members and faculty, AAC arranged for William Hexter, professor of biology, Amherst College and Barbara Kaster, McCann professor of communications, department of English, Bowdoin College to meet with the ad hoc committee. During the two-day visit the consultants explored with the review group the ways in which Trinity, Amherst, and Bowdoin were providing their students with a liberal education. Borden Painter,

10

professor of history and ad hoc committee chairperson, says that the consultants provided the outside perspective necessary to pinpoint what parts of Trinity's curriculum needed attention. "Discussing our curriculum with colleagues from outside Trinity," says Painter, "was very stimulating." He notes that the institutional similarities between Trinity and Amherst and Bowdoin helped the consultants understand the workings of Trinity, and he appreciates that Project Lodestar matches schools with consultants who have had experiences at comparable institutions.

During summer 1980 the committee decided to conduct a survey of alumni from the classes of 1965, 1968, 1971, 1974, and 1977. It hoped to learn how the graduates, before and after the 1969 curriculum revision, viewed their Trinity coursework and the curriculum structure. To assist in the survey's development, AAC invited C. Robert Pace, professor of higher education, University of California, Los Angeles, to work with the review committee. The final survey asked such questions as what percentage of your courses were taken in the four guideline areas and who was in charge of your course selection. Alumni also rated how their Trinity experiences assisted in providing benefits such as the ability to cope with complex moral and ethical issues, an understanding of major concepts of mathematics and quantitative analysis, and an awareness of different cultures and ways of life.

While the survey was being conducted and processed, the committee moved on to the next phase of its review. It collected information on enrollment patterns, numbers of different majors, and course selections. During the fall 1980 semester, committee members met with department chairpersons, the director of admissions, and the faculty members who had written the commissioned position papers. In addition, the committee conducted open sessions with faculty and students. John Maguire, then president of the State University of New York College at Old Westbury and now president, Claremont Graduate School served as a Lodestar consultant in October. Maguire, according to Painter, brought his insights both as an administrator and as a former faculty member. Painter says Maguire helped clarify some of the curricular issues and shared his experiences at various schools. Especially useful, Painter found, was Maguire's emphasis on the necessity for thinking through what structural changes would be required to implement any of the committee's proposals.

In spring 1981 the ad hoc committee on curriculum review presented its findings to the Trinity Curriculum Committee. Painter's group asserted that the open curriculum policy established in 1969 continues to be the most effective curriculum for Trinity's immediate future. The committee presented four recommendations which it felt would help strengthen the curriculum and encourage breadth of study. The recommendations proposed to charge the Curriculum Committee with the responsibility for regular and systematic curriculum review, to establish a Committee on Advising to strengthen the undergraduate advising system, to ask departments and programs to identify cognate areas which will assist their majors in broadening their courses of study, and to require a senior exercise for each major. Although the results of the alumni survey were compiled too late to be used in preparing the committee's findings, Painter says the data was compatible with their recommendations.

After distributing copies of the review committee's

report and conducting meetings to discuss and explain the recommendations, the Curriculum Committee presented its case to the faculty. In May 1981 the faculty approved all the recommendations. Trinity, according to Painter, is beginning to look at ways to implement the committee's proposals.

Painter characterizes the review committee as an agent for change. Its recommendations, he says, were modest, open-ended proposals that allow plenty of room for specific decisions on content and procedures. The senior exercise recommendation, for example, suggests that there should be an activity that represents the culmination of a student's work in a major but does not tell the departments how to implement this requirement. The Project Lodestar consultation, according to Painter, gave the committee the impetus to complete the review during the confines of a one-year study, provided insights into Trinity's curriculum, and demonstrated the necessity for faculty knowledge of and conviction to any proposed revisions.

For more information, contact:
Borden Painter
Professor of History
Trinity College
Hartford, CT 06106
(203) 527-3910

Mount Vernon College *Planning for the Future*

As part of its mission and purpose statement, Mount Vernon College affirms a commitment to providing a traditional liberal arts education to undergraduate women and to securing financial resources while planning for the future. To implement this mission and purpose statement, Mount Vernon College administrators in spring 1979 formed the college's first institutional long-range planning committee.

The formation of this committee marked the first effort by Mount Vernon College to engage in long-range planning on an institutional scale. Because this was a new venture, AAC believed that a Lodestar pilot consultation would be useful to Mount Vernon. Thus, Lodestar consultant John Bers, then planning officer, University of Alabama in Birmingham, met several times with Mount Vernon administrators to discuss different long-range planning models. Later in the Lodestar consultation process, consultant Eldon Parks, associate program director, Graduate Records Examination Program, Educational Testing Service, offered Mount Vernon College advice on enrollment and retention problems. With the help of the Lodestar consultants, the long-range planning committee developed a general planning model that helped it identify long-range institutional priorities and objectives.

Initially, Mount Vernon College administrators asked the long-range planning committee to focus its efforts on enrollment planning. This focus shifted toward more general planning, however, after Bers and the committee decided that traditional enrollment planning variables, such as demography: student distribution, had little relevance for a small college. Mount Vernon College has a full-time student enrollment of less than 500, so the long-range planning committee decided to consider enrollment planning as just one aspect of a larger effort to identify new stu-

dent markets and to determine institutional priorities concerning resource use and physical plant development over the next five years.

To successfully conduct this large planning effort, the long-range planning committee adopted a planning model suggested by Bers. Taking into consideration Mount Vernon College's manageable small size and lack of a central planning office, he suggested a planning model that demanded participation from many offices and constituent groups of that college. These offices and groups participated in both establishing an information base on many facets of the college's administration, resources, and student life, and in analyzing that information. For example, in the planning model's initial stage of establishing an information base, the business manager, after estimating changes in tuition and fees, projected the college's income for the next five years, while the coordinator of career planning projected the career opportunities and interests of women. The Admissions Office gathered information about high school students or junior college graduates in the Washington, D.C. area, while the registrar conducted an inventory of interdisciplinary or professional academic programs offered by colleges in the surrounding area. All of these offices agreed to assume a predetermined inflation rate, but no changes in current policies or levels of effort.

After establishing an information base, the long-range planning committee distributed the responsibility of developing the college's operational objectives to its three subcommittees. These three subcommittees, Student Life, Curriculum, and Finance/Development, analyzed and listed the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities of the college, and identified its most serious external threats. In conducting this analysis, the subcommittees consulted relevant constituent groups such as the Student Government Association and the Board of Trustees, thereby involving additional segments of the college in the long-range planning process. After the three subcommittees collected their information, the long-range planning committee presented it to the college president and administrative staff. Using the subcommittee's information, the president and staff then determined institutional priorities and specific objectives. These objectives, in accordance with Bers' suggestions, included an implementation strategy and the name of the person responsible for it, a time limit, a statement of resource requirements, and an evaluation procedure.

This kind of participatory institutional planning process led to an "extraordinary consensus among all constituent groups" at the college, according to Judith R. Weiner, vice president for academic affairs. In addition, the identification of institutional strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats prompted corresponding planning priorities. For example, having decided that two of Mount Vernon College's strengths lie in its low faculty-student ratio and its D.C. location, college administrators will design new academic programs that emphasize individualized attention for students; and they will improve the college's transportation system for easier access to Washington, D.C. Seeing the area of adult education as an opportunity, college planners will encourage the growth of the adult education program. The identification of weaknesses in the student counseling program will lead to increased attention to student psychological services, while the threat of an increasingly limited guaranteed student loan program will generate a search for additional scholarship funds.

The specificity of these long-range plans and the con-

sensus among the administration, faculty, and students about the institutional priorities led Weiner to comment that long-range planning at Mount Vernon College generally boosted morale and strengthened the college's dedication to its stated goals.

For more information, contact:

Judith R. Weiner
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mount Vernon College
2100 Foxhall Road, NW
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 331-0400

Hartwick College *Academic Planning*

The Hartwick Plan, a set of college-wide plans concerning issues such as the quality of academic advising and financial forecasting, was developed in early 1980 by Hartwick College's Planning Council. Chaired by the college president, the group includes faculty, students, and administrators. The council's plan lists as Hartwick's goal "the continuation as a solvent, autonomous, independent, residential, baccalaureate-granting, liberal arts college." It details what qualities, such as academic program and financial resources, are needed for continuation and outlines the objectives for each quality and how to determine when each objective has been accomplished. Indicators of success in certain areas include such measures as library circulation figures, student/faculty ratios, and numbers of students going on to professional schools.

In March 1980 Hartwick College applied to the Lodestar advisory services for assistance in implementing the council's Hartwick Plan. It was interested in receiving guidance on how to translate the detailed plan into actions. AAC selected Hartwick as a Lodestar school and assigned Paula Brownlee, then on leave as dean of the faculty, Union College as lead consultant. In October 1980 Brownlee made an initial visit to Hartwick. At this meeting administrators familiarized her with Hartwick College and the newly-written plan. Through their discussions, Brownlee and the college realized that the matter which needed immediate attention was not the implementation of the Hartwick Plan but rather the process of academic planning for a stable or shrinking resource base. They decided this could best be accomplished by having three consultants available to work with clusters of departments. AAC and the school identified Harry Bredemeier, professor of sociology, Douglass College, Rutgers University to work with the Social and Behavioral Sciences Division and Andrew DeRocco, dean of the faculty, Trinity College, Connecticut, to meet with the Physical and Life Sciences Division. Brownlee agreed to work with the Humanities Division as the school and potential humanities consultants could not make satisfactory scheduling arrangements.

Prior to the team consultant visit in March 1981, the college gathered together available information in a format which would provide consultants with a clear picture of Hartwick. As Bryant Cureton, vice president and dean of the college, assessed the project, the focus had shifted from how to implement the Hartwick Plan to 1) how Hartwick might become a stronger institution while allowing for the possibility of becoming smaller and 2) how the school can

develop linkages between administrative decision-making and faculty expertise in defining academic issues.

During the three-day team visit the three consultants received further orientation to Hartwick and met individually and in groups with the president, various deans, department heads, department chairpersons, the Planning Council, and the Faculty Council. The consultants discussed what concerned the faculty and how each department might participate in academic planning. Out of these meetings emerged the recommendation that the Faculty Council undertake a curricular analysis. It was hoped that such a review would aid in the development of an accurate mission statement.

The Faculty Council, Hartwick's curriculum committee, consists of two faculty members from each of the college's three divisions. The faculty pair from each division have formed subcommittees to examine each department in their division. A department's curriculum, according to Cureton, can be seen as three concentric circles. The center circle represents those courses which present the essence of a discipline, the next circle contains the essential electives in that discipline, and the outer circle represents the enrichment courses.

Each member of the two-person subcommittees is trying to understand a number of departments other than his or her own. They examine all a department's courses to determine where they fall in the concentric circle pattern, familiarize themselves with the discipline's language and philosophy, and compare how the department fits into national trends. By educating one Faculty Council member about each department, the college will have someone knowledgeable on the council when staffing recommendations need to be made. The departmental reviews began this spring, and the Faculty Council hopes to have them completed by early fall. At that time they will share with departments an informal working paper designed to aid in reviewing staffing decisions. Cureton anticipates that the paper will raise such questions as should a department hire a new faculty member to teach core courses when it has an excessive number of enrichment courses and how we can help this department function more effectively by adding more faculty.

Cureton believes that the curricular analysis will be successful in providing an internal gyroscope of where academic planning at the college needs to go. Although the Faculty Council recognizes the difficulty of the analysis process they are eagerly pursuing it. By having the analysis performed by department peers Cureton hopes to lessen the potential for faculty feeling threatened by the review.

In the near future Cureton hopes to secure the services of a humanities consultant to help the Humanities Division continue to sort out staffing and resource needs. He appreciated the Lodestar consultants' sensitivity to Hartwick's needs and their avoidance of imposing established models of academic planning. In the course of Hartwick's Lodestar project he has learned that both commitment and participation by faculty are important in making the school's efforts successful.

For more information, contact:

Bryant L. Cureton
Vice President and Dean of the College
Hartwick College
Oneonta, NY 13820
(607) 432-4200

Gwynedd-Mercy College

Revised General Education Curriculum

Since its founding as a junior college in 1948, Gwynedd-Mercy College has grown into a four-year institution with a firm commitment to producing liberally-educated graduates. The college awards associate and baccalaureate degrees in subjects ranging from biology and business computer programming to sociology and radiologic technology. Its mission statement includes the provision of "opportunities for the person interested in strong, career-oriented programs integrated with the liberal arts disciplines, so that students will be broadly educated individuals." Events in recent years, however, have caused administrators to question the adequacy of the college's general education program for its two- and four-year students.

In 1978 the college's Educational Planning Committee began an intensive review of the general education program. Among the concerns that precipitated the study were the lower SAT scores and skill deficiencies of incoming students, the increased enrollment in career-oriented programs, and the graduation of students with marginal general education skills. At the completion of the review, faculty and administrators agreed with the committee's findings that the program was not meeting the needs of the students. The committee, headed by Sister Joanne Whitaker, chairperson of the Natural Science Division, began a series of activities aimed at revising the general education program. These included a faculty workshop on the goals of general education, attendance at an AAC-sponsored workshop in general education, and application to the Project Lodestar advisory services for assistance in revising the curriculum and implementing the initial stages of the program.

Paula Brownlee, then on leave as dean of the faculty at Union College, was selected as the lead consultant for Gwynedd-Mercy College. In a visit to the campus, as well as through phone conversations and correspondence, she was able to gain a good understanding of the college's current general education requirements and the kinds of consultants needed by the school. On her recommendation, the planning committee developed a general education proposal to be voted on by the faculty prior to the consultant team visit.

The committee proposed a three-part program for general education at Gwynedd-Mercy. The first part of the program included distribution requirements in composition, religious studies, philosophy, and computer literacy. The second part consisted of three interdisciplinary core courses to be taken sequentially beginning in the sophomore year. Two-year students would take the first course of the core series. Electives taken to meet requirements in the students' areas of concentration made up the third part of the general education curriculum.

Eighty percent of the faculty voted in favor of the proposed changes. A closer examination of the vote revealed that many faculty from the divisions of humanities and language, literature, and fine arts were dissatisfied with the two suggested themes for the core sequences. Because these faculty would be responsible for ultimately implementing the core courses, volunteers from the two divisions formed a development committee to design alternatives to the planning committee's core courses.

In selecting consultants to assist Gwynedd-Mercy, Brownlee and the AAC staff looked for persons who would be able to assist faculty members in developing the upper division interdisciplinary core courses, grapple with academic resource allocations, and work with faculty in fostering the development of student competencies. Consultants chosen were Sister Austin Dougherty, academic dean at Alverno College, Nenah Fry, dean of the college at Wells College, and Willard Enteman, former president of Bowdoin College.

Over a three-day period, the consultants met as a group with various representatives of the Gwynedd-Mercy faculty and administration. During the meetings the groups explored the placement of general education requirements in the total curriculum, suggestions for alternative core courses, and the necessary commitment of vocational/professional programs to the core curriculum. The consultants explained how the general education requirements were just one part of the full curriculum which the school needed to review.

As a result of the consultation a new structure for the total curriculum has been proposed by the Educational Policy Committee. The revised curriculum includes foundation and mission courses, such as English composition, computer literacy, philosophy and religion; the three-course core sequence; concentration requirements; and electives.

The three-course core sequence, as redesigned by the development committee, provides two options for students. They may enroll in the urban studies/American studies/values and cultures series or the ancient world/medieval world/modern world series. Students begin one of the sequences in their sophomore year and complete the series with one course each during their junior and senior years. The objectives of both series include the development of moral values, communication skills, and an appreciation of various cultures. In the urban studies/American studies/values and cultures series, for example, the initial course examines urban problems in the Philadelphia area, the next course widens the subject area to America from the mid-19th century to the present, and the third course introduces Western- and Eastern-thought and scientific culture. The college anticipates offering the first course in each series during the spring 1982 semester with both series fully implemented during the 1984-85 academic year.

Gwynedd-Mercy College, according to Whitaker, will continue to implement the new general education curriculum. With the aid of Project Lodestar, the school was able to clarify its general education objectives and plan strategies for handling the logistics of the program. Whitaker especially valued the team consultant approach. "By having a wide diversity of skill and expertise present at one time," she says, "the meetings were more productive. We received an immediate response to our questions from four viewpoints, and the consultants were able to exchange and develop ideas as a team."

For more information, contact:
Sister Joanne Whitaker
Chairperson
Natural Science Division
Gwynedd-Mercy College
Gwynedd Valley, PA 19437
(215) 646-7300

East Carolina University Special Studies Program

For the past six years East Carolina University (ECU) has been enrolling a select group of students who, under normal admissions procedures, would be classified as inadmissible. These specially-identified students participate in a one- or two-semester program of intensive assistance in fundamental reading, language, mathematics, and study skills. The Special Studies Program (SSP) provides college-level credit in English, history, philosophy, mathematics, and library science. SSP students enroll in special sections of regular courses which meet more often and which emphasize the acquisition of basic skills.

In determining who may enroll at ECU, the Admissions Office uses a formula that takes into consideration such factors as students' high school grades, SAT scores, and class ranking and the history of success of their high schools' previous graduates. SSP students rank one-tenth to three-tenths of a percent below the cutoff point for admissions. Admissions officials determine that these students might have potential for successfully completing college. This assessment is made, for example, when a student has high SAT scores even though he or she earned low grades in high school or when one of the SAT scores is particularly high.

Because the difference between admissible students and special studies students is so small, ECU administrators are interested in extending some of the SSP courses and labs to other students who would benefit from the intensive assistance. Other areas of concern to the SSP are the coordination of the departmental courses with the reading and study labs, faculty recruitment, and the need for further diagnostic testing of SSP students.

Three Project Lodestar consultants visited ECU to assist SSP administrators and faculty in evaluating the program. They were John F. Newby, director, Developmental Education Program, Bowling Green State University; Jack R. Johnson, associate dean, Hamline University; and James S. Ackerman, associate dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Indiana University.

Prior to the consultants' visit, school officials prepared

information packets on the university and the Special Studies Program. Using these materials as background, the consultants were able to devote the majority of their site visit to clarifying their perceptions of SSP through interviews with the departmental coordinators of the program and faculty. During the day they spoke with the administrators about the feasibility of expanding various SSP components to other ECU students, the current duplication of some special studies programs with other ECU skills labs, and the necessity for providing faculty incentives and training.

With information gathered through written materials and interviews, the consultants evaluated the current status of the Special Studies Program and made written recommendations for its future. Their report summarizes the history and administration of the program and identifies both its strengths and weaknesses. The consultants noted, for example, that the enthusiasm and expertise of SSP staff and faculty should help make the recommended expansion of services possible.

Wendall Allen, SSP director and Project Lodestar coordinator, says that he was amazed at the insights acquired by the consultants in such a short amount of time. He describes the meetings as "soul searching" discussions rather than mere "chat sessions" and believes this shows that the consultants had a clear understanding of SSP concerns before arriving on campus. Much of the material gathered in the report, according to Allen, was not new to ECU administrators. However, the findings did confirm their own recommendations and will serve as a basis for support as SSP administrators look for the necessary funds to expand their services to other ECU students.

For more information, contact:

Wendall E. Allen
Special Studies Program Director (until September 1981)
William H. Cobb
Special Studies Program Director (beginning September 1981)
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC 27834
(919) 757-6212

The Forum for Liberal Education

Volume III, No. 8

Peggy Brown, Editor
Kim Merrill, Research Assistant

The AAC logo consists of the letters 'aac' in a bold, stylized, lowercase font. The 'a' and 'c' are connected, and the 'a' has a unique shape with a thick vertical stroke.

The Forum for Liberal Education is a topic-oriented publication featuring a subject of importance for liberal education in each issue. It does not endorse or evaluate institutional activity. Rather, it describes various ways in which institutions of higher learning address important common concerns. Upcoming issues of the *Forum* will look at women's studies, values literacy, and graduate liberal studies. The *Forum* staff is interested in receiving program information from our readers. If your school is chosen for inclusion in an issue a staff member will interview a contact person at your school and write the article.

The Forum for Liberal Education is published eight times during the academic year by the Association of American Colleges. The *Forum* is available at a subscription rate of \$16 per academic year for persons at AAC member institutions, and \$22 for all others. Copies of back issues and rates for multiple subscription orders are available upon request. Please address all correspondence, inquiries, and subscription orders to

FORUM

Association of American Colleges
1818 R Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202) 387-3760